

Frascati Physics Series Vol. 000 (2001), pp. 000-000
TITLE CONFERENCE - Town, Date, 2001

Using Lattice QCD and ChPT to obtain non-leptonic K-decay amplitudes

Maarten Golterman*

Dept. of Physics, Washington University, St. Louis, MO 63130, USA

Elisabetta Pallante

SISSA, Via Beirut 2-4, I-34013 Trieste, Italy

ABSTRACT

We summarize some of the difficulties that confront lattice calculations of non-leptonic kaon decay matrix elements. We review some of the methods that have been proposed to overcome these difficulties, and discuss the importance of one-loop ChPT in this respect, including the role of $O(p^4)$ operators.

In this talk, we will discuss some aspects of lattice computations of hadronic matrix elements, in particular those relevant for non-leptonic kaon decays. A more extensive review, with additional references, can be found in ref. [1]. In general, Lattice QCD provides us with euclidean correlation functions which are typically computed at unphysically large values of quark masses

* speaker at conference

and/or unphysical momenta (see below). In order to extract physical information, we can analytically continue the unphysical lattice results using chiral perturbation theory (ChPT), at least when we are concerned with the physics of Goldstone bosons of QCD.

There are several methods which are currently being used or investigated for the computation of kaon-decay rates. The oldest is to compute the $K \rightarrow \pi\pi$ matrix elements with not only the kaon but also the pions at rest [2], and use ChPT in order to continue to physical (*i.e.* energy-conserving) momenta. Alternatively, $K \rightarrow \pi\pi$ amplitudes can also be related through soft-pion theorems to the simpler $K \rightarrow \pi$ matrix elements which are, at least in principle, easier to compute on the lattice [3] (see also ref. [4]). Recent numerical work employing both these methods can be found in refs. [5, 6]. More recently, it has been suggested that the finite size of the spatial volume can be used as a tool to get to the physical $K \rightarrow \pi\pi$ matrix elements [7].

In what follows we will always assume that we are dealing with continuum-extrapolated lattice results, so that the usual ChPT techniques directly apply. On the lattice, one extracts $K \rightarrow \pi\pi$ matrix elements from euclidean correlation functions of the form

$$\begin{aligned} C(t_2, t_1) &= \langle 0 | \pi(\vec{q}, t_2) \pi(-\vec{q}, t_2) \mathcal{O}_{weak}(t_1) K(0) | 0 \rangle \\ &\sim \sum_n \langle 0 | \pi(\vec{q}, t_2) \pi(-\vec{q}, t_2) | n \rangle \langle n | \mathcal{O}_{weak} | K \rangle \langle K | K | 0 \rangle e^{-E_n(t_2-t_1) - m_K t_1}, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

for t_1 large. The dominant contribution to this correlation function at large euclidean times comes from the state with both pions at rest, *i.e.* $\vec{q} = 0$ and $E_0 = 2m_\pi + O(1/L^3)$, while the desired physical state, which has $|\vec{q}| = \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{m_K^2 - 4m_\pi^2}$, is buried in the tower of excited states of eq. (1) [8]. Note that for $|n\rangle = |\pi(\vec{q}=0)\pi(\vec{q}=0)\rangle$ energy is injected by the weak operator.

These simple observations lead us to the three aforementioned methods. In the approach proposed in ref. [7] one may work in a finite volume, in which the smallest non-zero momentum $|\vec{q}| = 2\pi/L$ is chosen such that $m_K = E_1 \sim 2\sqrt{m_\pi^2 + \vec{q}^2}$ (omitting interaction effects). If one can single out the first excited state, this gives the desired matrix element at finite volume, to which a correction factor can be applied to convert to infinite volume [7]. At the physical values of meson masses, this requires a rather large volume of order $m_\pi L \approx 4$, or $L \approx 6$ fm. It will be interesting to see whether this method can be made to work in practice. This proposal together with a related approach

[9] is further discussed by Guido Martinelli in these proceedings [6].

A second, technically much simpler, method is to compute the unphysical matrix element $\langle \pi(\vec{q} = 0) \pi(\vec{q} = 0) | \mathcal{O}_{weak} | K \rangle$, and use ChPT to convert it to the physical one [2]. This approach overcomes the problems implied by the Maiani-Testa theorem [8] since in the unphysical configuration with both pions at rest no final-state interaction phase is generated. A third method is based on the observation that ChPT relates $K \rightarrow \pi\pi$ matrix elements to $K \rightarrow \pi$ and $K \rightarrow 0$ transitions [3]. Issues which arise in the use of the latter two methods are: 1) the size of chiral corrections, and related, 2) the role of $O(p^4)$ ChPT operators, 3) finite-volume effects, and 4) quenching. Issues 3 and 4 can also be investigated through the use of one-loop ChPT.

As an example, let us consider the $\Delta I = 3/2$ decay $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0$. To one loop the physical matrix element is given by

$$\frac{[K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0]_{phys}}{m_K^2 - m_\pi^2} \propto \alpha^{27} \left[1 + \text{chiral logs} + d_K \frac{m_K^2}{(4\pi f)^2} + d_\pi \frac{m_\pi^2}{(4\pi f)^2} \right], \quad (2)$$

while for the unphysical matrix element with both pions at rest and $M_K = M_\pi = M$ the degenerate meson mass on the lattice [10] one has

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{[K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0]_{unphys}}{M^2} &\propto \alpha^{27}(N) \left[1 + \text{chiral logs} + d_s \frac{N}{2} \frac{M^2 + M_{sea}^2}{(4\pi f)^2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + d_v \frac{M^2}{(4\pi f)^2} + \frac{17.8}{ML} + \frac{12\pi^2}{(ML)^3} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

N is the number of (degenerate) dynamical fermions (=sea quarks) on the lattice, with corresponding Goldstone-boson mass M_{sea} (which on the lattice does not have to be equal to the valence-meson mass M). The quenched approximation corresponds to $N = 0$ (see ref. [1] for more details). The low-energy constant (LEC) $\alpha^{27}(N)$ is that of the real world for $N = 3$, even if the quark masses on the lattice are not at their physical values [11]. In the fully quenched theory, it may have a different value. Similar considerations also apply to the linear combinations of $O(p^4)$ LECs $d_{K,\pi,s,v}$. In addition, the linear combinations showing up in the unphysical matrix element can be different from those of the physical one: For arbitrary (on-shell) momenta p_K , p_{π_1} and p_{π_2} the contribution from $O(p^4)$ operators looks like

$$(\text{tree level}) \times \frac{1}{(4\pi f)^2} (AM_K^2 + BM_\pi^2 + Cp_{\pi_1} \cdot p_{\pi_2} + Dp_K \cdot (p_{\pi_1} + p_{\pi_2})) \quad (4)$$

In the physical case $p_K = p_{\pi_1} + p_{\pi_2}$ so that the expression in parentheses becomes $(A - \frac{1}{2}C - D)M_K^2 + (B + C)M_\pi^2$, whereas in the unphysical case $p_{\pi_1} = p_{\pi_2} = (\vec{0}, iM_\pi)$ and $p_K = (\vec{0}, iM_K)$ lead to the combination $AM_K^2 + (B - C)M_\pi^2 - 2DM_KM_\pi$, which does not yield the same information. The upshot is that one can determine the leading-order LECs, such as α^{27} , but not easily all needed $O(p^4)$ LECs.¹ The “chiral logarithms” in eqs. (2,3) are different in the two cases, and, for typical lattice quark masses, they are sizable. This is an indication that one should at least use ChPT to one loop in the analysis of lattice results for $K \rightarrow \pi\pi$ matrix elements.

To conclude this example, we note that there are also power-like finite-volume corrections, here given for a spatial box L^3 with periodic boundary conditions. These corrections come from pion-rescattering diagrams [10]. They may be large: for $f = 160$ MeV, $M_\pi = 500$ MeV and $M_\pi L = 6$ (typical lattice values of these parameters), they are about 20% of the tree-level contribution. By comparing computations on different volumes, JLQCD found good agreement between the prediction from ChPT of eq. (3) and results from lattice QCD (first paper of [5]). In general, one-loop ChPT gives a good fit of the JLQCD results (which are quenched, at $a^{-1} = 2$ GeV), with a reasonable value of d_v . It appears that one-loop ChPT is sufficient to explain the discrepancy [12] between unphysical ($K \rightarrow \pi\pi$) $_{\Delta I=3/2}$ lattice results converted to physical ones at tree level only of ChPT and the experiment.

A similar analysis can be carried out for $\Delta I = \frac{1}{2}$ decays. This case is however more complicated for a variety of reasons ($O(p^4)$ LECs being only one of them – for a nice review see ref. [13]), and it may be advantageous to use the chiral-symmetry connection to $K \rightarrow \pi$ matrix elements. At tree level in ChPT, this works as follows [3]. The desired $K \rightarrow \pi\pi$ matrix elements are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \pi^+ \pi^- | 27plet | K^0 \rangle &= \frac{4i}{f^3} (m_K^2 - m_\pi^2) \alpha^{27}, \\ \langle \pi^+ \pi^- | octet | K^0 \rangle &= -\frac{4i}{f^3} (m_K^2 - m_\pi^2) \alpha_1^8, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

in terms of the $O(p^2)$ $(27_L, 1_R)$ and $(8_L, 1_R)$ LECs α^{27} and α_1^8 respectively.

¹ In the more complicated case of $\Delta I = \frac{1}{2}$ decays, also total-derivative operators, such as $\partial_\mu [\Sigma \partial_\mu \Sigma^\dagger, \Sigma M^\dagger \pm M \Sigma^\dagger]_{\pm ds}$, appear at $O(p^4)$.

They can also be obtained from

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \pi^+ | 27plet | K^+ \rangle &= -\frac{4}{f^2} M^2 \alpha^{27}, \\ \langle \pi^+ | octet | K^+ \rangle &= \frac{4}{f^2} M^2 (\alpha_1^8 - \alpha_2^8),\end{aligned}\tag{6}$$

taking $M_K = M_\pi = M$ on the lattice. The new (unphysical) LEC α_2^8 can be determined from the matrix element

$$\langle 0 | octet | K^0 \rangle = \frac{4i}{f} (M_K^2 - M_\pi^2) \alpha_2^8.\tag{7}$$

To lowest order in ChPT, $K \rightarrow \pi\pi$ matrix elements can be therefore obtained from $K \rightarrow \pi$ and $K \rightarrow 0$, but the likely size of chiral corrections on the lattice (and in nature) makes it imperative to extend the analysis to, at least, next-to-leading order in ChPT. At one loop, ChPT predicts a behavior like [14]

$$\langle \pi^+ | octet | K^+ \rangle = \frac{4M^2}{f^2} [\alpha_1^8(1 + \log s) - \alpha_2^8(1 + \log s) + A_v M^2 + A_s N M_{sea}^2],\tag{8}$$

and analogous expressions for the other matrix elements. Indeed, for typical lattice masses, the logarithms can be large. Hence, they and the polynomial terms with coefficients $A_{v,s}$, which are linear combinations of $O(p^4)$ LECs, will have to be taken into account in fits to lattice data. Unfortunately, the combinations of $O(p^4)$ LECs contained in $K \rightarrow \pi$ matrix elements do not carry enough information to fully determine physical $K \rightarrow \pi\pi$ matrix elements up to $O(p^4)$. Also note that for $K \rightarrow 0$ and $K \rightarrow \pi$ with $M_K \neq M_\pi$ total-derivative operators can (and do) contribute. In this context we mention that there also exist subtleties with penguin operators in (partially) quenched QCD which have been discussed in ref. [15].

One lesson to be learned is that, in our view, it should be possible to extract reliable values of the $O(p^2)$ LECs α_1^8 and α^{27} from the lattice computation of $K \rightarrow \pi$ transition matrix elements. This is interesting in its own right, specially since phenomenological estimates of these LECs already exist [16]. In addition, we believe that the analysis of lattice results within the approaches considered here requires the use of next-to-leading order (*i.e.* $O(p^4)$) ChPT for a variety of reasons. The most important of these are to check for convergence of the chiral expansion, to reduce systematic errors coming from the use of ChPT, and to understand finite-volume effects.

References

1. M. Golterman, hep-ph/0011084.
2. C. Bernard *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **4**, 483 (1988).
3. C. Bernard *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **32**, 2343 (1985).
4. J. Bijmans, E. Pallante and J. Prades, Nucl. Phys. B **521**, 305 (1998).
5. S. Aoki *et al.* [JLQCD Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **58**, 054503 (1998); R. Gupta, T. Bhattacharya and S. Sharpe, Phys. Rev. D **55**, 4036 (1997); D. Pekurovsky and G. Kilcup, hep-lat/9812019; A. Donini, V. Gimenez, L. Giusti and G. Martinelli, Phys. Lett. B **470**, 233 (1999); T. Blum [RBC collaboration], Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **94**, 291 (2001); R. D. Mawhinney [RBC Collaboration], Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **94**, 315 (2001); A. Ali Khan *et al.* [CP-PACS Collaboration], Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **94**, 283 (2001);
6. G. Martinelli, these proceedings.
7. L. Lellouch and M. Lüscher, Commun. Math. Phys. **219**, 31 (2001).
8. L. Maiani and M. Testa, Phys. Lett. B **245**, 585 (1990).
9. C.-J.D. Lin, G. Martinelli, C.T. Sachrajda and M. Testa, hep-lat/0104006.
10. M. Golterman and K.-C. Leung, Phys. Rev. D **56**, 2950 (1997); Phys. Rev. D **57**, 5703 (1998); Phys. Rev. D **58**, 097503 (1998); E. Pallante, JHEP **9901**, 012 (1999); M. Golterman and E. Pallante, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **83**, 250 (2000).
11. S. Sharpe and N. Shores, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 094503 (2000).
12. C. Bernard and A. Soni, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **17**, 495 (1990).
13. C. Bernard, in “*From Actions to Answers*,” proceedings of TASI ’89, eds. T. DeGrand and D. Toussaint (World Scientific, 1990).
14. M. Golterman and E. Pallante, JHEP **0008**, 023 (2000).
15. M. Golterman and E. Pallante, hep-lat/0108010.
16. J. Kambor, J. Missimer and D. Wyler, Phys. Lett. B **261**, 496 (1991).